

THE FACTS OF THE CASE

AS TO THE PRETENDED

“BARONESS VON BECK”

Stated, and Illustrated with Documentary Evidence.



BY

J. TOULMIN SMITH, Esq.

LONDON:

TRELAWNY SAUNDERS, 6, CHARING CROSS.

Price Sixpence.

/f52.

10

THE FACTS OF THE CASE

AS TO THE PRETENDED

“BARONESS VON BECK”

Stated, and Illustrated with Documentary Evidence.



~~~~~

BY

J. TOULMIN SMITH, Esq.

~~~~~

LONDON:

TRELAWNY SAUNDERS, 6, CHARING CROSS.

—
Price Sixpence.

1852.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
Introductory Observations	3
I. Mrs. ——— to Mrs. Pulszky	10
II. The Impostor, under the name of Baroness von Beck, to Mrs. ———	11
III. Letter from F. de Carl to Mr. Pulszky	12
IV. Mr. Pulszky's Reply	13
V. Letter of General Haug	14
VI. Letter of General Vetter	14
VII. Letter of Mr. Hajnik	15
VIII. Evidence of Mr. Hajnik	16
IX. Kossuth's First Letter	17
X. Kossuth's Second Letter	18
XI. Statement of M. de Soden	18
XII. Letter of Mr. Pulszky	19
XIII. Statement of the United States' Chargé d'Affaires	20
XIV. Diary of one of the Impostor's Comrades	22
XV. Letter of General Kmety	25
XVI. Statement of Capt. Hahn	26
XVII. Statement of Baron Mednyanszky	27

[It must be distinctly understood that the Defendants in the action of "*Derra v. Dawson and others*" are not responsible for the statements in the following pages, in the publication of which they decline to concur. To myself, however, and to many persons of the highest character whom I have consulted, it seems that the publication of some statement of the facts is but due to the public.

5th August, 1852.

J. T. S.]

*image
not
available*

*image
not
available*

THE FACTS OF THE CASE

AS TO

THE PRETENDED

“BARONESS VON BECK.”

IN an article in the *Times* newspaper of the 3rd September, 1851, it is remarked that “We can always, to a certain degree, depend upon the internecine squabbles of the Refugees for the ultimate detection of any remarkable impostor. But detection may come too late. Irreparable mischief may have been caused before the pseudo-marquises, counts, and barons are stripped of their borrowed plumes, and reduced to their proper proportions as hair-dressers, couriers, or police spies.” That article was written with the *facts* as to the exposure of the Von Beck imposture at Birmingham before the writer and the public. It gives a sound view of the whole affair, and a correct, though brief, summary of those facts. What has since happened but too fully justifies the remarks of the *Times*. Imposture is always attempted because it is thought to be worth some one’s while to carry it out. For the same reason it has often happened that, even after exposure, it has been attempted to be bolstered up. It has so happened in this instance. The mischief done to the moral sense of the public becomes far more “irreparable” in such a case as the latter, than any that can accrue from the mere original imposture. Respect for public justice is weakened.

The honourable impulse to fulfil public duty and maintain good faith with the public is checked. A premium of impunity is held out to all future impostors.

In the case of the Von Beck imposture nothing whatever has occurred since the date of that exposure which called forth the just and judicious observations of the *Times*, to shake or weaken, in the least degree, the facts then published. Instead of this, those facts have been strengthened by multiplied evidence. But some ends were to be gained by bolstering up the imposition; and no means have been spared to accomplish this purpose. These depended for any success upon the public having lost sight of the real facts, and being thus prepared to be influenced by any misrepresentations, and by the appeals, thereon artfully founded, to sympathies and impulses noble and generous in themselves. A due respect to such sympathies, as well as a due regard for the maintenance of public good faith, seem, therefore, to demand that the actual facts should be again brought in a compact form before the public. The circumstance that the case of the plaintiff in the action of *Derra v. Dawson and others*, at the last Warwick Assizes, broke down, whereby the case for the defence was unheard, makes it essential that a delay *hitherto allowed only on account of that action* should be allowed no longer.

It is now intended, therefore, to give so much of the facts of the case as must be sufficient to satisfy any honest man of the imposture. Before doing this, a few remarks must be made on the trial in question, the mode of its termination, and the facts connected therewith.

That trial ended in the *Nonsuit* of the plaintiff. The mode in which the plaintiff's case was conducted, showed an unmistakable consciousness that, if the defendants should have the opportunity of being heard, all chance of sustaining the case of the plaintiff would fail; while, if the plaintiff's case alone were let be got out, it was felt that he would have the advantage of an *ex parte* statement before the public, however really unsustainable. It is impossible to believe in a *carelessness* so gross as could allow the subpœnaing of a subordinate constable instead of his principal; the absence of a *warrant* which might so easily have been made forthcoming; and the non-production of the

Police Sheet, in which whatever "information" there was would necessarily appear.

No impartial person can, however, have read even the case of the plaintiff on that trial without feeling that the imposture itself is but the more conclusively proved by it. Eleven months had passed since the original exposure. Ample time had been given for procuring any evidence that could be found of the reality of the accounts given of herself and her experiences by the woman. But not one tittle of such evidence, on either point, was produced. *The point* of the Imposture has always been declared to have been—the pretence that she was a Hungarian patriot, the "right hand of Kossuth," and a party personally (so as to vouch its truth) to what is told in her book. The question of "Baroness von Beck" or not, was always treated as entirely subordinate; that assumed title only serving to make the imposition on the public a compound one, and helping to carry it out the more successfully. Yet not one of the accounts given in her book, and clearly disproved at the exposure at Birmingham, in August, 1851, was even attempted to be proved true; while the only pretence of evidence as to her person was that, at certain places during the war in 1849, she *called herself* "Baroness von Beck;"—a fact which no one ever doubted. Even the evidence so given was inconsistent and contradictory, both with itself and with the published Book*. To this it may be added that not a single witness called was a man of any note or mark; while the plaintiff's counsel did not *dare* to put in the witness-box the only man of mark that had been subpoenaed by the plaintiff, because they found that he would break down their case instead of sustaining it.

As to Constant Derra himself, nothing whatever was proved or disproved at the trial further than was stated at Birmingham. It was indeed stated by one witness—put into the box to prove that father and son were, and always had been, on good

* Thus, in the "Personal Adventures," it is said, p. 5, that she was living at Vienna in October and November, 1848; and went thence, after her husband's death, to Hungary: while, at the trial, it was said that she applied, in deep mourning, for assistance to go from Hungary to Vienna to bury her husband, etc.! And one witness said Csanyi knew her, another that he did not know her before she introduced herself.

terms—that the father of this young man (one of the richest men in Hungary) had remitted him, by the special opportunity of private hand, in January, 1852, the handsome sum of *five pounds*! Derra's connection with the woman from April to August, 1851, was not denied. At the hearing in Birmingham, the explanation of that connection was stated by himself to have been his own needy circumstances, though he admitted the forewarning he had received that the woman was only an adventuress. On the same occasion he thanked me in English, in the presence of witnesses, for my forbearance in not pressing the charge against him*. No effrontery of denial can alter these facts. As the main object of the trial, however, unquestionably was to sustain the credit of the name and book of the *pseudo* "Baroness von Beck," it is quite needless to dwell on the merits or demerits of any of those around her. The Magistrates, with all the facts before them, declared the arrest of *both* parties justifiable. It is notorious that the practice of every day and in every place, and the only safe and just practice in the case of a person thus connected with a principal wrong-doer, is that which was followed in this instance. The personal habits, language, and deportment of the woman were not such as for her to be able to sustain her assumed rank before any educated intimate associate.

As to the practice before the Magistrates, on which so much has been said, and on which the learned Judge thought fit to say that it was "disgraceful" and "universally wrong," it needs remark that what is a universal practice is more likely to be right than the single opinion of a Judge. *Common Law* itself is simply universal practice. In the special case in question Common Sense and the "universal practice" agree. The only object of Depositions being signed, is that the witnesses may be bound over in recognizances to appear on the trial, when the matter is about to proceed thereto. If the case is abandoned, they are not bound over, and their signatures are clearly needless. What witness signs the evidence given by him at an Assize trial? Is the

* It was correctly stated by Mr. Gem (clerk to the magistrates) at the trial at Warwick, that, at the hearing at Birmingham, "Mr. Toulmin Smith said that, the woman having died, he did not wish to press the case against Derra; he only desired to lay before the Magistrates the grounds on which the prosecution had proceeded."

“universal practice” of Mr. Baron Alderson and all his brother Judges therefore “disgraceful” and wrong? It was shown in a letter to the *Times* of the 31st of July last, that it is to late statutory tinkering that we owe the want of a statement of the prosecutor’s name in the formal wording of Depositions.

With the warrant itself, or the proceedings thereto, I had nothing to do. Until the day before the warrant was executed, I was ignorant of any intention to apply for one, or to prosecute the impostor in any way. I advised, indeed, a very different course; and, while the possible contingency of a *public* application for a warrant was suggested, I emphatically declared that even such a step “would not be nearly so proper a course as the one already suggested” by me. This course was, to request the attendance of all interested, and to lay before them, in presence of the representatives of the Public Press, the proofs of the imposture. The matter, so far as I took interest in it, stood only on public grounds. The credit of the Hungarian Cause,—the cause of Constitutional Freedom,—and of the best men engaged in it, was involved. The exposure of the imposture, without any personal punishment, was all that seemed to me needed. Those who had been actually imposed on, and been themselves, though innocently, the means of others being taken in, naturally felt something beyond this. The proceedings which they felt themselves bound, from the responsibility thus incurred, to take, could not, of course, be interfered with by me. I knew that they were thoroughly justified in the steps they took, both by the universal practice in like cases, and by the facts of this case. Unless it is to be maintained that a cheat and impostor is to be allowed to go up and down the country unstayed, they were clearly bound to take some steps, or to submit to be themselves justly branded as *participes criminis*. As to the warrant having been executed in the evening, the reason assigned to me at the time was a sufficient one; namely, that it was expected the parties would leave Birmingham by the mail train that same evening. It was admitted by Constant Derra at Warwick that they intended leaving the next morning. As to the harshness of the alleged treatment in prison, the falseness of the allegations on this point has been already proved in print, and need not be here entered on.

With a consciousness of the weakness of the case they

support, some who have taken up the cause of the imposture would now pretend that, whether or not the woman really was what she assumed to be, has nothing to do with the facts and circumstances of the case, the arrest, etc. This is the same as to say that, whether a murder has been committed or not, has nothing to do with the arrest and detention of an alleged murderer. The proposition is absurd in itself. With a striking inconsistency, indeed, these very arguers feel that it is only by barefaced falsehood, and the denial of every fact, that their case can be sustained. In the face of the columns of every newspaper of the day, they venture to assert, rather contradictorily, that the charge made was shown to be absurd and groundless; that the proof of any charge failed completely; that no proofs of imposture were forthcoming, etc. etc.!! It is quite enough, at present, to refer, on these points, to the article already quoted from the *Times* of 3rd September, 1851.

It may be remarked that the magistrates were more likely to know the respectability of the parties prosecuting, and the value of their evidence, than any one at a distance. The opinion of the magistrates, after hearing all the case, is of rather more value and just weight than that of any Justice of Assize whatever, formed without even hearing what the case actually was. It is somewhat strange, indeed, that, under such circumstances, any opinion should have been volunteered by the latter. The opinion of the Magistrates,—not of one but of all, through the mouth of the Mayor,—was very emphatically pronounced.

Those who, with assumed indignation, and ludicrous pretensions to a care for the reputation of England for hospitality, now lavish epithets on the defendants in the case of *Derra v. Dawson and others*, and on every one else they can think of, are bound to show what course ought to have been taken. Is imposture and crime in every shape to go unchecked? Is every man who is cheated to *submit quietly* to the cheat, under penalty of being denounced for inhospitality if he bring him to justice? Is wrong to go without remedy? Is every man to be liable to public abuse for the discharge of his duties to his neighbours and the public? or is this only to apply when the criminal has been cunning enough to assume false rank and title? Those who denounce the conduct of the prosecutors, or others, in this case, become

thereby the upholders of fraud and imposture; the enemies of honesty, and of the due administration of justice; the violent interferers, so far as in them lies, with the equality and impartiality and unbiassed course of law.

The proceedings in the matter, in the House of Lords, cannot be alluded to without pain and indignation by any Englishman who respects the institutions of his country. A case is pending in a Court of Law. The plaintiff and his supporters are conscious that he must fail. Cannot a prejudice be raised? An *ex parte* and untrue statement is got up. A man is found so forgetful of the duties and responsibilities of his position that he does not hesitate, in the face of the notorious and published facts, to stand sponsor to this got-up case,—and, further, to make use of his accidental position to attack, behind their backs, men against whom he chooses to make random and reckless charges, for not one of which has he the shadow of a foundation*. The character of the House of Lords has received a heavier blow from such a transaction permitted within its walls, than from any assaults that democratic principles could have ever made out of doors. Further observation on this transaction, which is open to comment in many aspects, shall be forborne. It shall only be added, that a pledge was given to move for a Committee of Inquiry. It was safer, however, to forfeit this pledge than to face the truth. In the meantime, the English House of Lords has let itself be made the convenient instrument for carrying out the purposes of the Austrian police.

Had any of those who have enlightened the public with their remarks on this case, taken occasion to comment on the system of *secret warrants*, some public good would have been done, instead of fraud and imposture being merely cherished and upheld. All secretly-got warrants are clearly unconstitutional and dangerous. Against this system I have myself raised a more clear and strong voice than any man in England†. No power

* I forbear to reprint, here, the correspondence which has passed between Lord Beaumont and myself, in the hope that those feelings of a gentleman and sense of justice exist within him which will prompt an ample apology.

† See '*Local Self-Government and Centralization*,' chaps. 19 and 20, on "Summary Jurisdiction," and "Accusation and Judgment;" etc.

ought to be lodged in the hands of any one or two men to grant a warrant, except, at the least, after public application. The Common Law right and duty of arresting any person, *flagrante delicto*, is sufficient protection in other cases. But there has been of late years such intermeddling by statute in this matter, such a gradual but anxious bringing in of the centralized system of discretionary and arbitrary powers lodged in the hands of individuals, that there is no question but that the liberty of person is actually much endangered. No voice, however, has now been raised against this system. And, though I cannot myself too strongly reprobate the practice, yet, when a warrant had been so obtained by those actually the victims of the imposture, knowing as I did that what had been done was a daily practice, sanctioned by existing law, and knowing as I did that a warrant itself was entirely justified by the facts of this case, I neither then did, nor ever will, hesitate to support the proceedings subsequently taken in open court by all the assistance which the exposure of a common cheat and impostor make due to the English public, and to the credit and respectability of a righteous cause, and of a band of noble exiled patriots.

The documents which now follow were most of them put into my hands in order to carry out the recommendation made by me to lay the simple facts before those interested and the public press. For the sake of brevity, no unnecessary explanatory details are entered on. It needs only be said that the documents Nos. I., II., III., IV., V., VI., VII., and XI., together with the personal additional statements of Mr. Hajnik embraced in No. VIII., were the grounds upon which the defendants in the action of *Derra v. Dawson and others* proceeded. If these were not sufficient, there never yet was a criminal procedure in this country which had just and sufficient cause.

It is not proper to give the name of the writer of the letter first following. It suffices that the writer is a distinguished authoress, of long-established reputation.—

I.

Mrs. ——— to Mrs. Pulszky.

“ Dear Mrs. Pulszky,—I called upon you this morning to beg leave to consult you relative to some distressing circumstances which perplex and

grieve me; and yet it is not without the greatest reluctance that I apply to you, for I well know what a weight of sorrow you have to bear, for yourself and family, your friends and country; but I know no one so capable of giving me advice on the subject which distresses me, and I am sure your kindness of heart will pardon the trouble I give you. When last I had the pleasure of seeing you, I told you that I had been to see Baroness Beck, and the painfully distressed state in which I found her. She did not even inquire my name, and seemed quite overcome with gratitude for the small sum of three pounds which I ventured to put into her hand at parting. Yesterday I received by the post the enclosed letter, the style of which appeared to me so very different from that of her book, that I began to suspect they could not come from the same person; the book as well as the letter I know were both translated, but certainly by persons of very different abilities and sentiments. On the whole, I could not help suspecting that the letter might have been fictitious, and written by one of those persons by whom you hinted she was surrounded; for I could with difficulty conceive that Madame Beck would write a begging letter of the description of that which I enclose. Mr. ——— was so kind as to take it to her publisher, Mr. Bentley, to ascertain whether the signature was her own, and it has proved to be so. I am certainly very anxious to relieve her distress; at the same time it is neither in my power or my inclination to support her *entourage*, and even to risk that what I might send should fall into unworthy hands, whilst the poor woman herself derived no benefit from it. I know not how far I can rely on her own veracity, and felt quite at a loss what to do, when it occurred to me that you might possibly put me in the way, by some intermediate person, acting either for the Committee or otherwise, who would undertake to see that she was not left destitute; and I should be very willing to contribute towards her maintenance until she is able to do something for herself. In short, my dear Mrs. Pulszky, I shall be very grateful for any advice you can give me on this painful subject; and begging pardon for the liberty I take in applying to you, believe me ever,

Very truly yours,

The letter thus enclosed is as follows:—

II.

*The Impostor, under the name of Baroness von Beck, to
Mrs. ———.*

“Londres, le 15 Janvier, 51.

“38, Dean-street, Soho Sq.

“My Lady,—C'est avec une gratitude infinie que je vous adresse ces paroles, mais en même temps avec une honte indéfinissable devant vous avouer la situation exclusivement malheureuse dans laquelle je me trouve

à présent. Hélas! Madame, je suis tombée malade, et defendue de continuer mes travaux littéraires parceque mes forces spirituelles ainsi bien que corporelles s'y trop épuiseraient. Vous pouvez juger, Madame, quel est mon état actuel notamment si vous daignez y réfléchir que si je ne gagne pas ma vie des productions de ma composition, je suis mise dans l'expectative de mourir du faim. Cette somme-là que vous ayez eu la grâce de me donner m'a soulagée jusqu'à ce moment, et a empêché que mon landlord ne m'a pas mise à la porte. Mais dans ce moment-ci, où je souffre tellement, n'ayant rien de quoi vivre, et ne pouvant pas continuer mes projets littéraires, je suis jetée sur mon grabat, et le spectre hideux de la misère se dresse devant moi dans toute son horreur. Peut-être, ma biencherie, qui vous avez été déjà mon ange bienfaiteur, peut-être vous vous sentez motivée de me soulager encore pour quelques semaines, pour que je puisse rétablir ma santé, et je sois à même d'acquitter cette dette que j'ai contractée par votre faveur, et dont je me sens reconnaissable; on ne peut pas mieux. Peut-être qu'une de vos amies généreuses à laquelle vous voulez bien de peindre mon exigence est assez bonne de m'accorder quelque soulagement jusqu'à ce que j'ai retrouvé mes forces, qui me font capable de continuer mon train littéraire, le seul moyen qui me soit resté dans mon état malheureux de l'exile. Car voyez-vous, my Lady, je suis si abandonnée sans amis, sans connaissances, sans relations ici, et je ne connais personne qui puisse m'entr'aider si ce n'est pas vous qui vous vous êtes montrée si bienfaisante pour moi. Mr. Bentley, qui a publié mes aventures en Hongrie, ne m'a donné qu'une récompense très-moderée pour mon livre, et je n'ose pas lui demander quelque grâce. My Lady, je serais très heureuse si vous vouliez daigner me faire l'honneur d'une réponse quelque ce soit.

"Veuillez croire, Madame, à l'attachement respectueux et à la très haute considération avec lesquels j'ai l'honneur d'être votre très obéissante et très humble servante,

(Signed)

"MADAME LA BARONNE DE BECK."

With respect to the last document, as well as that which follows, attention is requested to the observations that occur hereafter under the head of Document XIV.

III.

Translation of a Letter from Ferdinand de Carl, to Mr. Pulszky, received the 16th of January, 1851.

"Honoured Sir,—Excuse that I, who am quite unknown to you, venture to give you some hints on a matter which is of the highest interest for you. I am not unaware how much you wished that a spiteful passage contained against you in the book of the Baroness von Beck, published by Richard Bentley, should not be spread, and that it was suppressed in consequence of your influential desire. As to England, you have succeeded; but the day before yesterday Frau von Beck sent the first volume of her German

manuscript to a German publisher (whose name is known to me), and at latest in a week the second volume will likewise be forwarded. The Beck Memoirs will therefore appear in a few weeks. In the second volume there is again a long detailed characteristic of your person, and of your conduct in your native country and in England, and even a picture of your 'domestic life;' and to make up for the circumstance that it has not been inserted in the English edition, it is written sharply, but with a destructive pen. In so far as you may wish to have this passage omitted, which I, as a born Hungarian, would sincerely advise you to do, I can assist you in this matter, as the author, *if he receives some token of gratitude**, would certainly be persuaded to destroy those passages. If you wish therefore to negotiate with the author (*of course without the knowledge of the Beck**) relative to this matter, I request you to be so kind as to let me know. But this must be done within the shortest time, as the manuscript of the second volume will be sent off in the course of next week.

"With high regard,

(Signed) "FERDINAND DE CARL.

"12, Queen Street, King Street, Long Acre,
near Seven Dials."

To this impudent attempt to extort money, admitting as it does that the pretended authoress was not the real authoress of the book, the following dignified answer was returned :—

IV.

*Translation of the Answer of Mr. Pulszky to Ferdinand de Carl,
dated January 17, 1851.*

"You are fully mistaken if you believe that I had the slightest part in Mr. Bentley's omitting some calumnies directed against me in Madame Beck's book. I was not aware of it; but, as Bentley had accepted the book in consequence of what I said (though without the fact being known to the authoress), he found it unbecoming that I should be abused in it. You now write that the German edition of Madame Beck's memoirs is to contain a detailed characteristic of my person, of my acts, and even of my domestic life; and you wish to negotiate that this passage should be omitted. I simply answer, that my character and my public life belong to publicity, and therefore may be judged by any one; that my private life does not shun the light of publicity; and that as to calumnies, I shall know how to meet them; and, lastly, that impertinencies never can extort money from me. As you see, you have been mistaken in my character; but I am in every case obliged to you for your well-meant intention.

(Signed) "FRANCIS PULSZKY."

In the following there is a mistake in the date, of 18th instead

* These italics are so in the original.

of 28th. But the point proved is the same; that no Baron Beck fell about that time, or was known at Vienna; and that no Viennese—who must necessarily best know the truth of these pretensions—would acknowledge this woman.

V.

Translation of a letter from General Haug, Chief of Staff under Bem, at Vienna, to Dr. Oppenheim.

“8, Barnard's Inn, Holborn, August 27, 1851.

“Dear Doctor,—To satisfy Mr. Pulszky's request before to-morrow morning, I instantly answer your kind lines. I do not know whether any Baron Beck belonged to the defenders of Vienna, still less if his wife received visits from the Representatives of the Diet, as I neither knew such a Baron nor Baroness at Vienna. It is possible that a Baron Beck occupied a sub-altern rank amongst the National Guards, but I cannot affirm it officially, because it is quite impossible for me to have known personally all the officers who served under General Bem or under myself. But I believe that I know all those who *fell*, as official reports always named the heroes. And though, on the 18th of October, 1848, I was in the Hungarian camp as Deputy of Vienna, yet it is not known to me that on that day an officer of the name of Baron Beck had fallen on our side, and certainly not at the barricades, because on that day there were none. I therefore cannot recognize the Baroness Beck as the widow of a fallen officer of Vienna, not as long as she has not verified her assertion by precise details. It is likewise the *first time* that I hear that this lady puts herself into the ranks of the Viennese emigration, as I have always heard of her as an Hungarian lady; but it is in the interest of every emigration to submit to a strict examination all those belonging to its national family before they are acknowledged as exiles; and as such, no Viennese will acknowledge Mrs. Beck on her mere assertion.”

(Signed)

“ERNST HAUG.”

VI.

Translation of a letter of Lieutenant-General Vetter, to Francis Pulszky.

“Dear Sir,—In reply to your letter, I assure you that I never have been in any official relation with the so-called Baroness Beck; that I have *never* even seen her; and that therefore the passages in her book as to my person are an *invention*.—Yours sincerely,

(Signed)

“VETTER, Lieut.-General.”

“August 27, 1851.”

VII.

Paul Hajnik to J. Toulmin Smith.

"4, Albert Terrace, Notting Hill, August 26, 1851.

"Dear Sir,—In consequence of your kind desire to give you some information about a certain person who pretends to be a Hungarian Baroness von Beck, I have the honour to state:—That, having been during our struggle the 'Chef de Section' in the Ministry of home affairs, entrusted to superintend the police of the whole country, I was in the position to know all the persons of distinction who played any conspicuous part in that period, or who, by their position or by their influence, were called upon to surround the Governor, Louis Kossuth. Therefore, I can assure you with full certainty that the person who styles herself Baroness von Beck can in no way be considered to belong to that category. She never was employed by the Hungarian Government in any other capacity than as a *paid* spy, whose task was to spy the position and the number of the inimical forces. Though I was in daily intercourse with the Governor, I saw her but twice; both times in the ante-chamber of Kossuth, in company of another woman, who in fact was the principal spy. At one of these occasions it happened that Kossuth desired me to give a passport to these two persons. It is, therefore, a shameless arrogance of the pretended Baroness von Beck to give herself for an intimate friend and for 'the right hand' of Kossuth, which, as I understand, she dares to assert, and even to have printed in England. It is likewise a falsehood that she is a *Hungarian* lady.

"I am, Sir, yours most truly,

(Signed)

"PAUL HAJNIK,

"Late 'Chef de Section' in the Home Ministry, and Member
for Waitzen at the Hungarian Diet."

As an impudent attempt was made at the trial at Warwick to misrepresent the position of the writer of the last letter, it will be proper, before adding the evidence which he personally gave before the magistrates at Birmingham, in open court, to state shortly his actual position.

Mr. Hajnik is a Hungarian noble, born at Waitzen, which place he represented, at the time in question, in the Hungarian Diet. He was one of the most distinguished civil lawyers in Pesth. He never was, as alleged by Constant Derra at the trial at Warwick, secretary to the Casino at Pesth. That Casino, which is fully described in Mr. Paget's well-known work on "Hungary and Transylvania," is more equivalent to the London Athenæum or Reform Club than to any other

establishment among us. Its superintendence was committed, besides paid secretary and so forth, to Directors. Among these, the well-known names of Counts Szechenyi, Andrassy, Zichy, Karolyi, etc., are found. Mr. Hajnik was one of these directors. It was, further, falsely denied at the trial that he was "Chef de Section" of Police. In June (or July) 1848 he succeeded General Perczel (whose name is well known) as "Chef de Section" of Police for the United Kingdom of Hungary and Transylvania. This was during the reign of King Ferdinand V. The office then formed a department of the Home Ministry. After Ferdinand's abdication, a political "Ministry of Police" was formed. In April, 1849, Mr. Hajnik was re-appointed to the office he had before held as Head of Department under this Ministry. Mr. Hajnik took an active part in the political discussions of the county and city of Pesth. In March, 1848, a deputation of eminent citizens was sent by the city of Pesth to the Diet at Presburg. Mr. Hajnik was nominated its head and spokesman; and in that capacity addressed the Diet. So important and influential a person was he indeed esteemed, that he was one of those whom the Austrian Government insisted should be guaranteed to be kept by Turkey, under penalty of a *casus belli* in the event of their escape, as may be seen by reference to the Parliamentary Blue Book on that subject. He had the further distinguishing mark of being hanged in effigy, with some of the most eminent of those who suffered for their country and for the constitutional liberties of Europe.

Such is the man whom Derra and his comrades have dared to attempt to lower in the eyes of Englishmen, conscious that his testimony alone was, and would always be with every honest man, overwhelming in proof of this imposture.

VIII.

*Evidence of Mr. Hajnik, given in open Court,
30th August, 1851.*

"He stated that he was a Magyar noble, and a member of the Hungarian Diet. He filled the situation of Chief of the Police for the whole united kingdom of Hungary and Transylvania. His duty was to maintain the civil safety of the country, and all the prisoners of war were under his superintendence. He held office under King Ferdinand V. until the 1st of

January, 1849. He was in Pesth, the capital, on that day. The Hungarian Government left Pesth for Debreczin on the last days of December, 1848. He was left at Pesth with Csanyi, an officer called the Head Commissioner. The entire management of Pesth was in their hands, and they were constantly together each day from early in the morning until late in the evening. Csanyi had interviews with several persons during that time, but never with any person calling herself the Baroness von Beck. He was personally acquainted with Kossuth, the Governor of Hungary, many years. His (witness's) official duties brought him constantly into communication with Kossuth. Three or four times a day, and often at night, Kossuth sent for him. The Government returned to Pesth in June, 1849, having been absent from December, 1848; he having been, in April, re-appointed to his office over the police. One part of his duty was to grant passports. He had the exclusive power to grant them. He remembered a woman at Pesth, known as, and calling herself, Racidula. He saw her in Kossuth's ante-chamber. He saw the same person last night in Mr. Tyndall's house. He never saw her in Kossuth's private room, nor was she ever an intimate friend of Kossuth; if she had been, he must have known it by his public position. She was a paid spy, and when he saw her in Kossuth's ante-chamber there was another woman with her, who was the principal spy. Racidula was to his knowledge a paid and subordinate spy. Kossuth on one occasion called him (witness), and said to him, 'Please give these people passes; they will go with you.' He never heard of the Baroness von Beck. There was a noble family named Beck in Hungary; but she never belonged to it, nor did she ever lose any estates in Hungary. He knew several Hungarian generals now in Paris and England. Several gentlemen whose names are mentioned in 'the Baroness's' book had told him that the parts relating to them were quite false—not a word of truth in them."

The above documents all disprove the pretences put forth by the impostor; prove them to have been *false* ones. Nos. V., VI., VII., and VIII., give specific disproof of the authenticity of her pretended book as a statement of facts, apart from the question of authorship. When the attempt at bolstering up the imposture, after the exposure at Birmingham, began, it was admitted that a word from Kossuth, whose intimate friend and right-hand, *by the name of Baroness von Beck*, she pretended to be, would settle the matter. Kossuth had not been in England twenty-four hours before he wrote the following:

IX.

Kossuth's first letter.

"Southampton, October 24.

"Dear Sir,—In reply to your note I beg leave to assure you that the name of 'Baroness von Beck' is utterly unknown to me. There was a

person named 'Racidula' employed by my government as a spy, whom I saw twice in my life, and gave some special instructions to, as to a spy. That is all I know about her.—I am, etc.,

"J. Toulmin Smith, Esq.

(Signed)

"L. KOSSUTH."

But no sooner was this conclusive letter published than the upholders of imposture sought to evade it. Kossuth has, however, lately again emphatically endorsed it. He happened to arrive in England on the very day on which the cause of *Derra v. Dawson and others* was set down for trial. The attorneys for the defendant immediately requested his attendance as a witness. To this he replied as follows:—

X.

Kossuth's second letter.

"You would oblige me very much by not mixing me up, at the very moment of my arrival from the United States, in a case where my evidence would be very inappropriate; so much the more as every thing I would say I have already told in a letter written in Southampton, and published in the papers in October last.

(Signed)

"L. KOSSUTH."

The following gives proof equally of the baseness of the woman and of the disgraceful use to which "secret service money" is put:—

XI.

Statement of Charles de Soden.

"13, Sussex Street, University, August 26, 1851.

"In reply to the inquiry contained in your kind note, I beg to inform you that the person styling herself 'Baroness de Beck' is the same who, accompanied by Dr. Heinemann, offered *personally* her services as a spy and informer to the recently-established foreign branch of the English police force. This I know from good authority, and I know likewise that for a fortnight or three weeks she has obtained for such services the sum of £5. 16s. 8d. per week. It is also no secret to me that the *soi-disant* Baroness introduced herself to the Commissioners of the Police by forwarding a letter written by Dr. Heinemann, and containing an enclosure, which consisted of some articles and regulations adopted by an association of the German Communists in London. With regard to Mihaloczy, he himself has admitted to me that the baroness instigated him to the attack on your husband, and that she has defrayed all the expenses of the subsequent proceedings. Should it be requisite, I will with much pleasure substantiate the above statement by the production of unexceptionable evidence. Trusting you will use your best endeavours in placing the illiterate she-impostor

before the public in her true character, and in tearing the mask from her unblushing countenance, I beg to subscribe myself yours very respectfully,
 (Signed) "CHARLES DE SODEN."

The following letter will most properly be placed here. It shows what the real *animus* was of one against whom many false and slanderous attacks have been directed in reference to this matter.

XII.

Francis Pulszky to J. Toulmin Smith.

"34, St. Petersburg Place, Bayswater, Aug. 28, 1851.

"Dear Mr. Toulmin Smith,—The affair with the so-called Baroness Beck is really disagreeable to me. I remained long silent, though I knew that she calumniated me; but she is an old wretched woman, broken in health, therefore I pitied her. Now, since her behaviour endangers the Hungarian cause, I must speak.

"She came to England in the spring of 1850. I knew her not; several of the Komorn people told me she was one of our spies, known under the name of Racidula, and Baroness Beck; sometimes she gave herself for the wife of Mr. Danielis, with whom she lived. As all the spies have a great many *aliases*, I therefore did not inquire which is her real name; and I think it would be difficult to ascertain which is the true name of her. She got from the Hungarian Committee just the same amount which every other refugee got at this time. Some months afterwards, Mr. John Edward Taylor brought me a German MS., about three sheets, with the request to give an opinion on it, as it was offered to Bentley*. I found that the matter *better digested* might form an amusing book. Upon this, Bentley took the book.

"You know that this publication was very well received by the public, Madame Beck making a novel out of the Hungarian war.

"Several persons interested themselves for her, on account of her book. Mrs. — wrote a letter to Mrs. Pulszky, which I enclose, and wished to get some information about her. We told her that she is an unhappy woman who has served us as spy, but that she is no lady at all;—no Baroness in the world would ever sign a letter as she did, *Madame la Baronne de Beck*; and her behaviour and her manners show it clearly that she got no education at all. She is not even able to write a letter in *any language*; she does not speak nor understand Hungarian. We recommended her to the *charity* but not to the *society* of Englishmen. She was, moreover, surrounded by bad characters, one — —, a German, who was compromised in a *great theft* in Germany; one — —, a Hungarian, who was excluded from the Emigration at Hamburg for his ungentlemanlike behaviour; one — —, the man who assaulted me for having refused to

* The sheets thus shown to Mr. Pulszky *did not contain* the earlier pages of the published work.

him more money, after he had pledged himself not to importune any longer the Committee if he would get ten pounds;—he got them, but then returned anew and anew.

“ Later I inquired about her former life in Hungary, and was assured by trustworthy persons that she was not even the principal spy, but that a certain — — was the principal spy,—she was the attendant. A threatening letter I received from M. De Carl shows it, in what way either she or her companions wished to extort money from me, and how she is despised by her secretaries, who deny it that she is the authoress of the books under her name.

Had Madame Beck really been what she pretends to be, *the right hand of Kossuth*, she surely would have as many letters from him as I have. Every post from Constantinople brings me one; how is it now, that she never receives one?

“ The letter of Lieutenant-General Vetter is sufficient to show the veracity (!) of Madame Beck’s memoirs. The Hungarians laughed all, when they read her book: General Klapka the most, when he read that she was present at his interview with Haynau.

“ Had she been such important a person, how is it that General Klapka never mentions her in his memoirs?

“ I think all this is quite sufficient to establish her real character.—Excuse the visible haste, as I am very much occupied, and believe me,

“ Dear Mr. Toulmin Smith, yours faithfully,

(Signed)

“ F. PULSZKY.”

XIII.

The Statement of the United States’ Chargé d’Affaires.

The book itself, published under pretence of its having been written by this woman, contains abundant internal evidence of its want of authenticity. This evidence would pass unobserved by the mass of English readers, requiring, as it does, a familiarity with the details of places and events. Several such instances were pointed out at the hearing before the Magistrates at Birmingham. But a fresh illustrative instance can now be given of the absence of authenticity, even in points with which, as the servant of the principal spy, *Racidula* might be supposed to have been acquainted. On pages 36, etc., of “ *Personal Adventures* ” (first edition), it is told how the pretended writer,—this woman of 54, as sworn by Derra at the trial at Warwick,—was sent to the United States Embassy at Vienna, and how she concealed her despatches. Mr. Stiles, the United States Chargé d’Affaires, has lately published his own narrative of what then took place. Let the two be compared. It will be found that they are wholly

irreconcilable, both as to the person and the mode of carrying the despatches. The upholders of this Imposture must necessarily charge Mr. Stiles with wilful and motiveless falsehood. Every one else will see, as the fact was, that this Impostor never went on such a mission at all. It was the person named in Mr. Pulszky's and Mr. Hajnik's letters, as the "principal spy," who was sent on that mission. Racidula picked up only a clumsy and erroneous account of it,—wrong even in the date.

The Impostor's Account.

"Görgey entrusted me with a despatch for the — Embassy at Vienna. . . . I had entrusted to me a letter from Kossuth to the — Embassy, [etc., etc., including another blunder in calling Mr. Motoschitzky a *Baron*, which he is not.] My military friends advised me to conceal the letters in my haversack. This did not appear to me good counsel. . . . I caused one of the planks of the cart to be hollowed out at the end, without breaking the surface of the side, and placed all my letters in the space thus formed. The plank was then replaced, and the joining at the end rubbed over with clay. . . . On the evening of December the 5th I left Presburg. . . . Early on the 6th I entered Vienna. . . . I repaired to the Hotel of the — Embassy, where I was received with the greatest attention. . . . In the evening I received the promised answer of the — Ambassador to Kossuth's letter."

Mr. Stiles' Account.

"On the night of the 2nd December, 1848, the author was seated in the Office of the Legation of the United States at Vienna, when his servant introduced a *young female*, who desired, as she said, to see him at once upon urgent business. *She was a most beautiful and graceful creature*, and, though attired in the dress of a peasant, *the grace and elegance of her manner, the fluency and correctness of her French*, at once denoted that she was nearer a princess than a peasant. . . . [A wagon rack was fetched into the room.] This rack, which is a fixture attached either to the fore or back part of a peasant's wagon, and intended to hold hay for the horses during a journey, was composed of small slats, about two inches wide and about the eighth of an inch thick, crossing each other at equal distances, constituting a semicircular net-work. . . . An hour nearly was consumed before we could get the rack in pieces. When this was accomplished, we saw nothing before us but a pile of slats; but the fair courier, taking them up one by one, and examining them very minutely, at length selected a piece, exclaiming, 'This is it!' By the aid of a penknife, to separate its parts, this slat was found to be composed of two pieces, hollowed out in the middle, and affording space enough to hold a folded letter. . . . [The reply was only written next day]

"The statement, therefore, of a person assuming the title and name of *Baroness Beck*, and who, in a work upon the Hungarian war, pub-

lished in England about two years ago, claimed for herself the credit of having been the bearer of the despatch referred to, is altogether without foundation."—"Austria in 1848-9," vol. ii. p. 156, note.

Mr. Stiles expressly says, on the 12th December of the same year, that he had "heard nothing more from either side."—*Ib.* p. 403.

It might be thought that the impudent ignorance of imposture could go no further than what has been already shown in respect to this woman. But such is not the case. This impostor, whose imposture has been and is being attempted to be bolstered up, after exposure, by some who set themselves up for great critics, went up and down the country obtaining money under pretence of subscriptions to her forthcoming "Autobiography." This "Autobiography" was actually advertised to "contain the Baroness's Reminiscences of her Residence at the Court of Vienna during the reigns of the *last three Emperors.*" There happen not to have been any "last three Emperors" of Austria. The "last three" who succeeded to the Austrian dominions were Leopold (1790), Francis (1792), and Ferdinand (1835); the two latter only were *Emperors* of Austria. But, passing over this blunder of the impostor, her translator, and the eminent critics who support the imposture, and admitting that she meant, not "Emperor" but "reign," it will be a matter of curious speculation how much a woman of fifty-four years of age in 1851 can have seen, and be able to tell, of her residence at the Court of a sovereign who died in 1792!

XIV.

Diary of one of the Impostor's Comrades.

Some very remarkable additional evidence relating to this imposture has been furnished by a *Diary* written in the Hungarian tongue, which was found in the house whose hospitality the impostor had abused in Birmingham. It contains no name or mark indicating who was the writer. It was not written by the principal impostor herself, for she could neither write nor speak Hungarian. Two of her comrades (besides Derra) visited her while there: but each of these, like Derra himself, denied, at Warwick, that he had ever called her as she is

called in this Diary. Who was the writer is, however, of no importance. The contents, of which the opportunity of inspecting a translation has been afforded me, speak for themselves. It will be enough here to call attention to a few points.

The *Diary* extends from the 1st of January to the 26th of August, 1851. The first noticeable fact is, that the impostor is therein many times called "Racidula;" never, except once with a sneer, spoken of as "Baroness." Where not called "Racidula," she is called simply "Beck" with the feminine termination.

On the 6th of January is the entry "Conspiracy [*conjuration* is the force of the original] at ——'s:" and several other entries occur, showing the sort of thing that was going on in this direction.

Attention must now be recalled to the documents No. II. and III. above. The date of each of these is 15th January. Now in the *Diary* there occurs, on the 12th of January, the following entry:—"Consultation at Racidula's." And, on the 15th itself, the writer expressly enters:—"At Racidula's." There can be no doubt that these letters were planned at the "consultation" of the 12th. In the begging letter of the 15th the impostor says she is "abandoned by her friends, without acquaintances;" and declares she must die of hunger if not relieved. But it is proved, by this Diary, that, at the very time this letter was sent off, the writer of the Diary was frequently with her; that "consultations" were held with her; and on the 9th of February is the entry "With Beck and her *comrades*." And it appears by the same Diary that, with no means of lawful income appearing since the date of the letter of the 15th of January, this woman and her comrades lived in anything but a starving state.

From the same *Diary* it is demonstrated that the writer of it was also the concocter of the whole or greater part of the book which was to be foisted on the public as the "Autobiography of the Baroness von Beck." No less than three "*agreements*" with her are expressly mentioned. The following entries speak for themselves:—March 3. "My work pleases Beck." March 7. "Beck has had my work copied." March 20. "Beck has great need of me." April 25. "Much writing of Beck's Memoirs." April 28. "First volume of Memoirs." August 6—*two days after* it is recorded in the same Diary that the

woman had gone from London to Birmingham, the writer of the Diary remaining in London—"New beginning of Beck's Autobiography." August 11. "Memoir writing." In the same Diary are entries of disappointments in payments of money by the woman to the writer, and of actual payments made; while, in another part of the same document, there is found a page of accounts, in which, on the *creditor* side, stands the following:—

"MEMOIRS.			
	£.	s.	d.
May 20th.			
Copying	1	0	0
Original	9	10	6
[Other credits are mentioned amounting to]	17	3	3
	<hr/>		
	27	13	9
Paid	8	2	0
	<hr/>		
	£19	11	9"
	<hr/>		

Thus the Diarist very properly charges, not only for his labour in writing the *original* of the pretended "Autobiography," but for the copying of the first manuscript. No doubt this was according to the terms arranged in the three agreements (March 1 and 9, and April 12) already mentioned.

One public journal has vouched that the woman "conducted herself with entire respectability upon English soil." Without polluting these pages with any of the disgusting details which it would have been proper for the defendants, in the case of *Derra v. Dawson and others*, to have proved, and which they were prepared to prove had not the plaintiff broken down, it is quite sufficient to take, on this matter, the words of this Diary. Such entries as the following are conspicuous:—"Beck is a real hag;" "The lesson has been useful to Beck;" "Quarrel with Beck;" "Beck grows daily tamer;" "The Baroness furious on account of —!" "Beck a harpy;" etc., etc.

It is needless to quote more of this Diary at present; and the publication of any of the names mentioned in it is purposely avoided.

Many persons have, since the exposure in Birmingham, borne their testimony in support of the facts then proved, and in elucidation of various points unknown before, and which, though not further proving the fact of imposture, it will be satisfactory to the public to have ascertained. It is apprehended that it will be quite enough if the three following of these are given. They go to

the three points of—1st, What the real behaviour and estimation of the woman was in the Hungarian camp; 2nd, When the woman assumed the name of “Baroness von Beck,” and what excuses she gave for it to Hungarians; and who and what she really was; 3rd, Who she was *not*, and who are the members of that honourable family of which she pretended to be born.

The name of General Kmety is too well known to every one at all acquainted with the Hungarian story, to need much to be said of its owner. He was General of Division; held in the highest estimation by men of all parties; and the only Hungarian General who did not end his career with the surrender at Vilagos. It was he who fought the last battle for Hungary, at Lugos, on the 16th of August. He, too, has been hanged in effigy by the magnanimous government of Austria.

XV.

Translation of Letter from General Kmety.

“London, August 3rd, 1852.

“Sir,—You inquire whether I have known, during the Hungarian war, a so-called Baroness von Beck, who has written two volumes of Memoirs on herself and the war.

“This person roamed about (*trieb sich herum*, literally *vagabondized*), in the months of April, May, and June, 1849, also in my camp, and was called indifferently either ‘*Racidula*’ or, simply and more in derision, ‘the Baroness’ (without any family name). She made herself somewhat conspicuous by her affectation, and her obtruded chatter, in which she gave herself out to be going to the enemy to get information. As she really produced a Hungarian passport, she passed without an difficulty my troops, without being questioned as to the aim of her mission.

“But she never was an object either of attention or respect, for already her big phrases showed her rather an “*aventurière*” than a lady of rank.

“Her Memoirs are full of ridiculous self-importance,—with which she endeavours to put her obscure person in the foreground, at the expense of truth and of the great and just cause of Hungary.

“She mentions my name there several times, always coupled with insipidly absurd untruths, which I do not find it worth my while to refute; and I am very much astonished to see that the Papers give an importance to a woman of dubious name and character such as they have scarcely given to the Russian invasion of Hungary.

“I remain, with respect, Sir, yours sincerely,

(Signed)

“GEORGE KMETY,

“J. Toulmin Smith, Esq.

“Late Hungarian General.”

XVI.

Translation of the Statement of Captain Hahn.

"I arrived in Vienna (October 8th, 1849), and was staying at the Hotel 'Zur Prager Eisenbahn,' where I became acquainted with Madame Beck. At that time she already professed to be a Baroness; but in my presence Dr. Sigm. Epstein, of Vienna (a medical officer formerly attached to the staff), told her that he was obliged to desire the omission of that title, as he knew her to be the artificial flower-maker 'Racidula';—whereupon she replied with great effrontery that Kossuth had created her a Baroness. The commander of the 'Aula,' afterwards a Major in the German Legion, Mr. Reinfeld, made a similar request of her in my presence; and the so-called Baroness observed in reply, that Kossuth had confided to her the execution of several orders, and she was authorized by him to assume the title 'Baroness' during her engagement.

"The most convincing proof, however, that she had no claim whatever to the title was afforded me in a somewhat ludicrous manner.

"A person named 'Agneta,' laundress and sempstress, who is still among the living, and who lodged in one of the suburbs of Vienna (Florensdorf, No. 13), took care of my linen as well as that of the late Beck; and one day, a quarrel having originated between the two, 'Agneta' poured forth the secret that both had served one and the same family in a menial capacity. This assertion confounded the Baroness, and imposed silence on her. Afterwards she expended much money to reconcile the laundress and to hush-up the matter.

"These circumstances would have opened my eyes respecting the so-called Baroness, had I not already, from the commencement of my acquaintance with her, had the conviction that she had no right whatever to the title; both her language and manners were not calculated for me to entertain a favourable opinion of her.

(Signed)

"CAPT. SIGM. EDW. HAHN,

"Sept. 19th, 1851."

"12, Bateman's Buildings, Soho."

It is expressly pretended by the impostor and her confederates that she belonged to the family *Horeczky* of the county of *Nyitra* [German *Neutra*]. The supporters of the imposture are thus tied down to proof of that lineage and birth-place. The following document effectually demolishes this part of the imposture. It will be remembered that Mr. Hajnik speaks to there being no such person as Baroness Beck of the *family Beck*.

It is proper to state that the Baron Cesar Mednyanszky, the writer of this document, belongs to one of the most distinguished families in Hungary. His father, Baron Aloys Mednyanszky, was a Privy Councillor, President of the Aulic Chamber [Ex-

chequer], Lord Lieutenant of this very county of Nyitra itself, the author of several books on Hungarian tradition, and co-editor of Hormayr's celebrated historical archives. His brother, Baron Ladislas Mednyanszky, was Commander of the fortress of Leopoldstadt, and hanged for his patriotism by the hero Haynau at Presburg in June, 1849. The Baron Cesar Mednyanszky was an eminent ecclesiastic before the Revolutionary War. On the breaking out of that War, he was appointed to the high function of Grand Almoner to the Hungarian Army; a rank which is well known usually to imply previous episcopal dignity, although the character and distinguished abilities and position of the Baron Cesar Mednyanszky raised him to it before having received episcopal ordination.

XVII.

Statement of the Baron Cesar Mednyanszky.

“Paris, le 1er Août, 1852.

“Monsieur,—Les relations qui existaient entre moi et plusieurs membres de la famille des Barons Horeczky *avant* la Révolution Hongroise, me mettent à même de vous donner les renseignements que vous me demandez sur les dames Beck-Horeczky.

“Il n'y a que deux dames Horeczky qui portent le nom des Barons Beck. L'une, Amélie Horeczky, est l'épouse du Baron Beck, ancien commandant d'Olmütz. Elle vit encore, et j'ai l'avantage de la connaître. L'autre, Marie Horeczky, est la femme du Lieutenant-colonel Baron Beck, frère du susdit. Je ne la connais pas, mais je sais positivement qu'elle vit actuellement en Italie.

“Etant sûr et certain que j'avance des faits incontestables, je vous autorise de publier ma présente par voie des journaux, ou bien si cela ne vous paraîtrait plus nécessaire, de déclarer au moins en mon nom ‘que Racidula n'avait rien de commun avec les deux dames susnommées; conséquemment, que l'allégation de ses défenseurs ne s'éloigne pas seulement de la vérité, mais qu'elle est entièrement fausse et controuvée*.’

“Si quelqu'un de vous voulait écrire en Hongrie, au Baron Ferdinand de Horeczky à Rohow (comté de Neutra), ou bien au Baron François Horeczky, curé de Csèjthe (comté de Neutra), il vous serait facile de vous

* In another communication the Baron Mednyanszky expressly says:—
“I authorize you to declare, in my name, to whomsoever it may concern, that ‘the pretence of the upholders of the late Racidula is forged and false; that there is not, and never has been, any other Baroness Beck, born Horeczky, than the two above-named baronesses, both of which ladies are still living’.”

en convaincre. La réponse que ces messieurs donneront devra être nécessairement écrasante pour les défenseurs de la prétendue Baronne de Beck.

“ Dans l'espoir que les renseignements que je viens de vous donner vous seront de quelque utilité, je vous prie, Monsieur, d'agréer l'assurance de ma parfaite considération, avec laquelle j'ai l'honneur d'être votre très dévoué serviteur,

(Signed)

“CESAR MEDNYANSZKY.

“A M. Toulmin Smith.”

The documents thus published are sufficient. That an Imposture so barefaced as that exposed at Birmingham in August, 1851, should have met, among Englishmen, with any upholders after that exposure had taken place, may indeed well make every honest Englishman blush. But it is still more discreditable that, in order to uphold it, the tribunals of this country should have been sought to be held up to scorn; the course of Law to be perverted; the most generous sympathies of humanity and the promptings of public and private duty to be abused, distorted, and chilled;—while every patriotic and just sentiment has been deliberately trifled with. It was not enough that the scandal brought by this impudent imposture upon the honourable Refugees, patriot sufferers for the cause of Constitutional Freedom, should have been exposed. It has been the anxious effort, of some from selfish motives, of others from political motives, to keep alive the scandal, and bolster it up. But all such efforts are vain. No honest man in England can remain deluded, however much longer the pretensions of the upholders of the imposture may, in the language of the *Times* article already quoted, “be enforced with all the artifices of conscious rascality.” Those who have helped to expose the Imposture have fulfilled the duty which lay on them, both in true hospitality to all worthy Refugees, and as good neighbours and good citizens of their own country. The consciousness of this will always prevent their being disturbed, either by careful misrepresentation or by coarse abuse. The acknowledgment of what is owing to truth and honesty and public good faith will in due time come.

J. TOULMIN SMITH.

London, 5th August, 1852.